

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Darren Starr

v.

Civil No. 04-cv-002-SM

Northern NH Correctional Facility, Warden

**O R D E R**

Defendants' objection and plaintiff's traverse make clear that defendants have now complied with all discovery sought by the motion to compel (document no. 79) except for Requests For Admissions #12-14 directed to defendant Young. These requests ask:

#12. Whether plaintiff was transported on 8 January 2006 outside NCF for an emergency visit?

#13. Whether the transport was to the home of Joseph Barry in Manchester? and

#14. Whether defendant was classified C-3 on that date?

While the answers are "yes", "yes" and "yes", defendant has refused to answer based upon lack of relevance and burdensomeness. The latter response is silliness and, for an Attorney General's Office, which constantly complains of being

overworked, the time spent by it in resisting the requests and in making the objection cannot be justified. Answering "yes" does not make the request admissible but it does save time of the over-stretched Attorney General and does not waste the court's time on an objection for which no legal analysis has been supplied.

The motion (document no. 79) is moot except Ms. Young is to answer/request for admission numbers 12-14.

**SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James R. Muirhead  
United States Magistrate Judge

Date: May 26, 2006

cc: Darren Starr, *pro se*  
Mary E. Maloney, Esq.